



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,659	12/13/2005	Andrew Austen Mortlock	101117-1P US	2270
44992 7590 03/31/2009 ASTRAZENECA R&D BOSTON 35 GATEHOUSE DRIVE WALTHAM, MA 02451-1215				
EXAMINER				
TRUONG, TAMTHOM NGO				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1624				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/31/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/560,659

Applicant(s)

MORTLOCK ET AL.

Examiner

TAMTHOM N. TRUONG

Art Unit

1624

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 18-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 23 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 18-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1-11-07
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

NON-FINAL ACTION

In the response of 10-29-08, applicants have elected the 17th compound in claim 23 for the purpose of searching and examination. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 15-17 are cancelled. Claims 1-14 and 18-23 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 1-14 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons apply:

a. Claim 1 recites the term “prodrug thereof” which is a broad limitation followed by narrow limitation which is amide (e.g, C(O)NHR¹⁷ or NHC(O)R¹⁸) and ester (e.g., -CO(O)R⁹). A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App.

& Inter. 1989). The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949).

b. Claims 18 and 22 recite the phrase "hyperproliferative disease" which is a broad limitation followed by the narrow limitation of "such as cancer". A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949).

c. Claim 19 recites step (i) which is the step of "converting a compound of the formula (I) into another compound of the formula (I)". It is unclear as to which compound is converted into which.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. **Scope of Enablement (hyperproliferative disease):** Claims 18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of treating **colorectal cancer**, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of treating hyperproliferative diseases. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The following factors have been considered in the determination of an enabling disclosure:

- (1) The breadth of the claims;
- (2) The amount of direction or guidance presented;
- (3) The state of the prior art;
- (4) The relative skill of those in the art;
- (5) The predictability or unpredictability of the art;
- (6) The quantity of experimentation necessary;

[See *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int., 1986); also *In re Wands*, 858 F. 2d 731, 8 USPQ 2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988)].

The breadth of the claims: Claims 18 and 22 recite: “A method of treating a human suffering from a hyperproliferative disease,...” which includes the treatment for many diseases such as: colorectal cancer, breast cancer, lung cancer, prostate cancer, bladder cancer, renal or pancreatic cancer, leukemia or lymphoma, etc. Thus, the scope of claims 18 and 22 is unduly broad.

The amount of direction or guidance presented: For the treatment of cancers or cell proliferation, the specification describes only two *in-vitro* assays. Both assays using cell line of SF21 (insect ovarian cell line) and SW620 (colorectal cell line). Since insect ovarian cells and colorectal cells have morphology different from other cell types, the inhibition on said cell lines cannot be applicable for other cell types such as: breast, pancreatic, lung, prostate, renal, bladder, etc. Thus, the specification does not provide adequate guidance nor does it reference art recognized correlation to enable the extrapolation of the data presented to the treatment of hyperproliferative diseases encompassed by claims 18 and 22.

The state of the prior art: Although quinazoline compounds are known to treat cancers, it is still a challenge to treat many cancers such as small-cell lung cancer, leukemias, lymphomas, pancreatic or renal cancer. Each type of cancer metastasizes at a different rate and may or may not respond to certain drugs. Therefore, the *in-vitro* model for one cell line cannot predict the activity for other cell lines as according to Voskoglou-Nomikos et. al., which discloses that not all *in-vitro* models are predictable for various types of cancers (e.g., see the abstract on page

4227). Thus, the state of the art does not support the treatment of several cancers based on the *in-vitro* model of only one cell line.

The relative skill of those in the art: Even with the advanced training, the skilled clinician would have to carry out extensive research to select an effective compound from the large Markush group of formula I. Not only one has to determine an IC_{50} value, but also *in-vivo* activity to establish an LD_{50} , therapeutic index and pharmacokinetic profile for each compound. Given a large Markush group of the claimed formula I, such a task would require a tremendous amount of effort, time and resource.

The predictability or unpredictability of the art & The quantity of experimentation necessary: The pharmaceutical art has been known for its unpredictability due to various conflicting path ways, or biological factors that are sometimes genetically unique to individuals. In the instant case, the specification has not shown how a compound of formula I could treat a variety of diseases or cancers when only the human cell line of SW620 has been tested.

Thus, given the unpredictable nature of the art, and the vast number of compounds claimed herein, one skilled in the art will have to carry out undue experimentation to use compounds of formula I as recited in the above claim.

Specification

3. This application contains sequence disclosures at page 40 that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.821 (a(1) and a(2)). However, the fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.821 through 1.825 for the reason(s) set forth below: Nuclei acid sequences of 10 or more nucleotides and amino sequences of 4 or more residues need to be designated with a sequence identifier. Wherein attention is directed to paragraph(s) § 1.821 (c) and (e). Although an examination of this application on the merits can proceed without prior compliance, compliance with the Sequence Rules is required for the response to this Office action to be complete.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claim 23 is allowable because it recites species substituted with (1H-1,2,3-triazol-1-yl)acetamide which is not taught or fairly suggested by the prior arts of record.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TAMTHOM N. TRUONG whose telephone number is (571)272-0676. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T and Th (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tamthom N. Truong/
Examiner, Art Unit 1624

/James O. Wilson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624

Tamthom N. Truong
Examiner
Art Unit 1624

